

REMARKS

Claims 16-25 are now pending in the application. Claims 16 and 17 are allowed. Claims 18, 19, 21-23 and 25 stand rejected. Claims 20 and 24 are objected to. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner states that claims 16 and 17 are allowable over the prior art of record. The Examiner also states that claims 20 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 20 and 24 into independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended claims 20 and 24 are thus patentable and in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holzer, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,565 hereinafter Holzer). Claims 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Langhoff (U.S. Pat. No. 5,306,025 hereinafter Langhoff). Claims 18 and 22 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright (U.S. Pat. No. 5,433,457 hereinafter Wright). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note independent claims 18 and 22 each include the limitation of "said second edge of said shank portion includes an angularly disposed

edge section which is in a plane angularly offset from said cutting edge of said cutting portion” and “said second edge of said shank portion being stepped so as to be laterally offset from said back edge of said cutting portion.” Applicants respectfully assert that neither Holzer, Langhoff nor Wright teach or suggest these features as claimed.

Holzer fails to teach or suggest a saw blade that contains both the limitations of an “angularly disposed edge section” and an edge section of the shank which is “laterally offset.” With respect to Langhoff, Langhoff also fails to teach or suggest an edge of the shank being “laterally offset” as claimed. Rather, Langhoff discloses a saw blade having a shank which is extending along the same axis with the cutting portion. In addition, Wright fails to disclose a shank portion of a saw blade being laterally offset from a cutting portion. Similar to Langhoff, Wright merely discloses a shank portion which is extending along the same axis as the cutting portion.

Accordingly, as neither Holzer, Langhoff nor Wright teach or suggest Applicants’ invention as claimed in independent claims 18 and 22, Applicants respectfully assert claims 18 and 22 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103 AND 103

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable by or, in the alternative, under U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Holzer. Claims 21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable by or, in the alternative, under U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Langhoff. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holzer in view of Tseng (U.S. Pat. No.

5,664,792 hereinafter Tseng). Claims 19 and 23 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langhoff in view of Tseng. Claims 19 and 23 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright (U.S. Pat. No. 5,433,457 hereinafter Wright) in view of Tseng. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note claims 19, 21, 23 and 25 each depend from either independent claims 18 or 22. As stated previously, Applicants believe claims 18 and 22 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 19, 21, 23 and 25 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's finding of Official Notice as used in these rejections is improper as the Examiner has failed to cite a prior art reference which discloses that these features are obvious as required under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections and the Examiner's finding of Official Notice are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb. 3, 2005

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/EKS/ps